

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

Proposed Policy

- March 31, 2000 -

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) at Western Kentucky University is a peer-based process that will: (1) respect the important values and practices of traditional academia, specifically academic freedom and tenure; (2) recognize good performance and encourage professional development; and (3) allow intervention in cases of demonstrated incompetence or neglect of duties.

POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) should acknowledge good work, point out areas for improvement, identify the most productive uses of faculty member talent and expertise, identify opportunities to energize a faculty member whose performance has been low or lift an already productive member to new levels of achievement.

Frequency of the PTR Process

The department head (Note: throughout this document, the term *department head* is used to refer to department heads, division chairs, department chairs, or any other designation for unit leader) shall conduct annual performance evaluations according to current procedures. Tenured faculty shall enter the comprehensive post-tenure review process under the following circumstances:

In the fifth academic year after receiving tenure and every subsequent five-year period, all tenured faculty members shall enter the PTR process. Tenured faculty holding administrative positions, including department heads, deans, and the vice presidents, shall enter a comparable, comprehensive administrative review process on a similar cycle. For faculty members who have been tenured for more than five years, the PTR shall be phased in over no more than a five-year period. Approximately 20% of the current faculty five years beyond tenure shall be reviewed each year so that all tenured faculty shall have undergone PTR five years after the initial implementation of PTR. Faculty who have formally committed to retirement may be exempted from the PTR process.

Those faculty undergoing the review process for promotion to full professor may be exempted from the PTR process with the promotion decision being used in lieu of the PTR evaluation. Faculty choosing this option will not be required to undergo PTR until 5 years following promotion to full professor. Faculty on sabbatical or other approved leave who are up for PTR may defer the PTR review to the following year.

PROCEDURE

Department Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee. A peer review committee, made up of tenured faculty in the department or unit except the department head and the individual(s) under review, shall evaluate the faculty member(s) in that department or unit undergoing PTR in a given year. The composition of the department PTR committee will be determined by the department, but shall

have a minimum of three members. At the discretion of the department, one member of the PTR committee may come from another Western Kentucky University department or unit. The committee will elect its own chair. It is recommended that training in performance evaluation be made available for Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee members. Any faculty member designated to serve on a PTR committee who is biased against a faculty member undergoing PTR shall recuse him/herself from the PTR committee. The committee shall evaluate the faculty member's performance against the current standards for evaluation of post-tenure faculty in the individual's department or college, typically those used for the annual review of post-tenure faculty. Departments are expected to identify their evaluation criteria for the Department Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee. The PTR appraisal shall include a current vita and the individual's annual activity reports or summary of activities from the previous five years documenting how activities met the identified standards. Department head and dean evaluations and comments shall not be included in these materials. The department head will assist the Committee in ensuring that the relevant materials are provided to the PTR Committee by September 15.

The Department Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee will determine a rating of iES, MS, NI, D, or SD such that:

Exceeds Standards (ES) = the faculty member exceeds standards (i.e., performance beyond that required to meet standards; exceptional performance should be recognized or noted as appropriate by the review committees)

Meets Standards (MS) = the faculty member meets expectations (i.e., standards are met)

Needs Improvement (NI) = deficiencies are identified but are not considered chronic or substantial (i.e., they can likely be addressed without a formal remediation process)

Deficient (D) = deficiencies are considered substantial and must be remedied or performance sanctions, up to and including termination for cause, shall be imposed. A formal remediation plan shall be formulated with time-lines and criteria for annual progress.

Severely Deficient (SD) = performance deficiencies are so severe as to warrant a recommendation of termination for cause.

By October 10 the department committee shall report its finding in writing to the department head. The department committee is encouraged to provide constructive written feedback for the faculty member. The faculty member under review will be provided with a copy of the department committee's finding by October 17 and will be given an opportunity to respond in writing by October 27.

Faculty Who Receive an iES or iMS Departmental Rating. The PTR evaluation process will stop at this point for faculty who receive a rating of iES or iMS from the department committee. Faculty members who receive a rating of iES may be nominated by their departmental committee to compete for the college-level PTR awards described subsequently.

Faculty Who Receive a iNIi Departmental Rating. Faculty members who received a iNIi rating by the departmental committee shall, with the department head and based on the department PTR committee feedback, initiate activities as described under iImprovement Plansi in the Outcomes section of this document. The department head and faculty member may consult with the PTR committee in developing the improvement plan. The PTR evaluation process will stop at this point for these faculty members.

Faculty Who Receive a iDi or iSDi Departmental Rating. Faculty members who receive a rating below iNIi by the departmental PTR committee will be reviewed by the department head using the same standards utilized by the departmental committee. The department head shall review the faculty member's portfolio and respond with written comment and a recommendation from the five options listed above. The faculty member under review will be provided with the department head's recommendation by November 5 and will be given an opportunity to respond in writing by November 15.

For those faculty members who received a rating below iNIi by the departmental PTR committee, the department PTR peer committee report, department head recommendation, and any comment submitted by the faculty member shall be forwarded to the college dean. The dean shall review all submitted information using the same standards utilized by the departmental PTR committee and shall forward all information to the provost along with his/her own recommendation by December 15. The faculty member under review will be provided with the dean's recommendation by December 18 and will be given an opportunity to respond in writing by January 5. By January 15, the provost shall review all submitted information, consult as appropriate, and notify the deans in writing of any disagreements with their recommendation. In cases other than recommendations of termination for cause, written notification of the results of the reviews shall be sent to the dean, department head, and the faculty member by February 1. If the faculty member disagrees with the decision of the provost, he/she may appeal through the Faculty Grievance Procedure described in the Faculty Handbook. Upon concurrence from the department head, dean, and provost of a finding of unsatisfactory performance with substantial deficiencies as described in "D" above, the faculty member shall enter a period of formal remediation. The provost shall forward any recommendations of termination for cause to the president of the university by February 1, as described in the Faculty Handbook. The president shall follow the university policy on termination for cause.

All Faculty Undergoing PTR. The departmental PTR decision for all faculty undergoing PTR and subsequent department head and dean evaluations for those evaluated as iDi and iSDi by the departmental committee will be forwarded to the provost and will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and copied to the dean.

OUTCOMES

The PTR process provides a particular opportunity to acknowledge and reward faculty whose career performance has been consistently superior.

Monetary PTR Awards - A one-time monetary award of no less than \$2,000 shall be given to individual faculty members identified as outstanding by the College PTR Award Committee. This award shall be put into an individual account which (a) shall be available for a 36 month period and (b) may be used for travel, equipment, or professional development at the discretion of the faculty member. A line item of no less than \$30,000 will be in the budget for these awards. This line item should be adjusted annually to reflect the average percentage increase in the faculty salary pool. Each year departmental PTR committees may nominate

faculty members who have received an iESi rating to be considered for this award. The department committees will provide the College Post-Tenure Review Awards Committee with the name and PTR materials of those nominated for award by November 5.

College Post-Tenure Peer Awards Committee. A college post-tenure review awards committee shall be constituted annually in each college. Each college PTR committee will select the faculty member(s) from that college who will receive the PTR award(s). The college committee shall be made up of one tenured faculty member from each department or division within the college, elected by a vote of all tenured faculty in the college from two nominees designated by the department or division. A college committee shall consist of no fewer than 6 members; all members should be from that college. This committee structure may be altered within a college to ensure appropriate representation of each department or division. The college committee will elect its own chair. Each college committee will identify the standards they will use to make the PTR monetary awards; the evaluation will be based solely on the materials submitted by the faculty member for PTR. The number of faculty awards per college will be proportional to the number of tenured faculty in each college. (i.e., the number of awards for each college will be approximately: Ogden-4, Potter-4, GFCOB-2, CEBS-3, Community College-1, Library-1.) The college committee shall review all submitted information and forward the names of the award winner(s) to the college dean by December 1. The award winners shall be notified in writing by December 15 and the award money shall be placed into an individual account for the faculty member(s) no later than February 1 of the following year.

Professional Development Plans - It is assumed that all faculty and academic professionals are committed to continuing growth and improvement to maintain and/or achieve excellence in their professional performance. Thus, all who move through the PTR process are expected to have identified future goals and objectives and general plans for achieving them. The degree of specificity of these plans that will provide a sense of direction and professional aspiration will vary, depending upon the results of the PTR review. Those faculty whose review suggests more serious need for improvement must develop more specific and regularly monitored plans.

Improvement Plans - For those faculty members with identified, but not chronic, deficiencies (i.e., "NI" above), the faculty member and department head shall develop a written long-range improvement plan for the next PTR evaluation period. This plan should include at least the following:

- 1) identify specific strengths and areas for improvement
- 2) define specific goals, activities, or outcomes to capitalize on the strengths and address identified weaknesses or deficiencies.
- 3) outline principal activities to be undertaken to achieve goals and outcomes.
- 4) set time-lines within which to reach goals/outcomes.
- 5) identify appropriate criteria to monitor and assess progress with follow-up at regular intervals.
- 6) identify source of any funding, support resources, or institutional commitments (if required).

This plan may be modified and adapted, with the consent of the department head, to capitalize on new opportunities or to deal with unforeseen circumstances.

Remediation Plans - For those whose deficiencies are more serious, (i.e., "D" above) the faculty member shall enter a formal remediation period. A specific remediation plan shall be worked out between the faculty member and the department head, and approved by the dean. The plan shall be considered a contract and should be placed in the faculty member's file and appropriately monitored. A faculty member who is consistently below standard shall be reviewed at shorter intervals. The spirit of the remediation plan is to encourage, support, and measure the quality of faculty performance in meeting expectations. In addition to the six points

addressed above, the remediation plan should include a statement of possible or projected consequences for failure to improve performance.

It is critical that the remediation plan identify specific targets. Failure to meet targets shall result in appropriate disciplinary action. After a period of no more than one year, there should be a special evaluation by the department head to monitor progress toward plan goals. The remediation plan may stay in place no more than two years as a means to achieving satisfactory performance. Consequences for nonperformance over the predetermined period of time must be carefully spelled out and might include reassignment, probation, salary freezes, or termination. The severity of the consequence should reflect the severity of the performance deficiency.

The faculty member and department head shall meet frequently and at least twice annually to monitor progress toward the goals. The provost and dean are to work with the department head to monitor the effectiveness of the process and to assure appropriate resources and follow-up are provided to the faculty member.

When the objectives of the remediation plan are achieved, upon recommendation of the dean and department head, the faculty member shall be removed from the remediation process and shall return to the normal evaluation process. Monetary resources for PTR remediation will be a line in the budget of no less than \$25,000. The manner in which these resources will be used for remediation will be determined on a case by case basis by the department head and dean in collaboration with the faculty member.

EVALUATION OF THE PTR PROCESS

On-going formative review of the PTR process should be conducted annually as well as an institutional summative review every 5 years. Faculty and other constituencies involved in the PTR process should be involved in the review. The review should measure the effectiveness of PTR in accomplishing its stated objectives and should determine the benefit of PTR to faculty members and the institution. The intent and results of the review should be communicated widely and effectively. The PTR process should be modified based on the results of the review.

Note: Minor adjustments may be made to the identified due dates to accommodate weekends and holidays. After the year 2000, the actual due dates will be announced by April 15 of each year.

POST-TENURE REVIEW TASK FORCE - SPRING 2000

Dr. Richard Ayres (3299), Community College
Grise Hall 401

Dr. Sue Bryant (3499), Nursing
Academic Complex 108C

Dr. Linda Calendrillo (3046), English Department Head
Cherry Hall 100

Dr. Darwin Dahl (5074), Chemistry
Thompson Complex- North Wing 309

Dr. Brian Goff (3855), Economics & Marketing
Grise Hall 404

Dr. Robert Jefferson (6311), Dean, GFCOB
Grise Hall 445

Ms. Elaine Moore (6122), Library Public Services
Margie Helm Library 104C

Dr. Donald Nims (6316), Educational Leadership
TPH 417A

Dr. John O'Connor (4427), Psychology Department Head
TPH 276

Dr. John Petersen (5468), Associate VP for Academic Affairs
WAB 222

Dr. Bob Reber (2490), Management & MIS
Grise Hall 217

Dr. Betsy Shoenfelt (Task Force Chair) (4418), Psychology
TPH 264

Joe Downing

Montée Sainte-Barbe
84500 Menerbes
Tél. : 90.72.33.63
Fax : 90.72.44.45

041

KENTUCKY MUSEUM

Sandra L. STAEBELL.

Dear Mr. Sandra.

Receipt confirmed.

I send your fax to L.P.ART.

Sincerely.

Roma